

### REMARKS

The above amendments to the above-captioned application along with the following remarks are being submitted as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated March 7, 2006 (U.S. Patent Office Paper No. 20060302). In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, the Examiner is respectfully requested to give due reconsideration to this application, to indicate the allowability of the claims, and to pass this case to issue.

### Status of the Claims

As outlined above, claims 2-9 stand for consideration in this application, wherein claims 1 and 18-19 are being canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, while claims 2-9 are being amended to correct formal errors and to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject invention. Claims 10-17 stand withdrawn from consideration in this application. All amendments to the application are fully supported therein. Applicant hereby submits that no new matter is being introduced into the application through the submission of this response.

### Formal Objections

Claims 2-9 and 19 were objected to, alleging that "A method" should be "The method" as to reflect the dependent claim formats.

Objection of claim 19 is moot because claim 19 is being canceled as set forth above. Claim 2 is being amended to be in independent form. In addition, as suggested by the Examiner, claims 3-9 are being amended. Accordingly, withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

### Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants thank the Examiner for holding that claims 2 and 4-8 would be allowed if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 2 is being amended to be independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim, namely claim 1. Accordingly, claim 2 would be allowable. Claims 3-9, which now depends upon claim 2, would also allowable for the same reason to allow claim 2.

Applicants acknowledge the Examiner's statement of reasons for allowance as set forth in the Office Action. However, Applicants will point out that the reasons for

allowability of the above referenced claims are not limited to the reasons for allowance as set forth in the Office Action.

Conclusion

In view of all the above, Applicants respectfully submit that certain clear and distinct differences as discussed exist between the present invention as now claimed and the prior art references upon which the rejections in the Office Action rely. These differences are more than sufficient that the present invention as now claimed would not have been anticipated nor rendered obvious given the prior art. Rather, the present invention as a whole is distinguishable, and thereby allowable over the prior art.

Favorable reconsideration of this application as amended is respectfully solicited. Should there be any outstanding issues requiring discussion that would further the prosecution and allowance of the above-captioned application, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative at the address and phone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

\_\_\_\_\_  
Stanley P. Fisher  
Registration Number 24,344

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Juan Carlos A. Marquez  
Registration Number 34,072

**REED SMITH LLP**  
3110 Fairview Park Drive  
Suite 1400  
Falls Church, Virginia 22042  
(703) 641-4200

**July 5, 2006**